

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International Application No

I/EP2004/005971

A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER

IPC 7 A61K31/4412 A61K31/4418 C07D213/89 C07D409/12 A61P31/12

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)

IPC 7 C07D

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

Electronic data base consulted during the International search (name of data base and, where practical, search terms used)

EPO-Internal, WPI Data, PAJ, BEILSTEIN Data, CHEM ABS Data

C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category *	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
A	WO 02/06246 A (ONTORIA ONTORIA JESUS MARIA ; ANGELETTI P IST RICERCHE BIO (IT); GARD) 24 January 2002 (2002-01-24) claims 1,12	1-17

 Further documents are listed in the continuation of box C. Patent family members are listed in annex.

* Special categories of cited documents :

- *A* document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance
- *E* earlier document but published on or after the International filing date
- *L* document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)
- *O* document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means
- *P* document published prior to the International filing date but later than the priority date claimed

T later document published after the International filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention

X document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone

Y document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art

& document member of the same patent family

Date of the actual completion of the international search

6 October 2004

Date of mailing of the International search report

13/10/2004

Name and mailing address of the ISA

European Patent Office, P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2
NL - 2280 HV Rijswijk
Tel. (+31-70) 340-2040, Tx. 31 651 epo nl,
Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016

Authorized officer

Bérillon, L

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

Box II Observations where certain claims were found unsearchable (Continuation of item 2 of first sheet)

This International Search Report has not been established in respect of certain claims under Article 17(2)(a) for the following reasons:

1. Claims Nos.: because they relate to subject matter not required to be searched by this Authority, namely:

Although claim 14 is directed to a method of treatment of the human/animal body, the search has been carried out and based on the alleged effects of the compound/composition.
2. Claims Nos.: because they relate to parts of the International Application that do not comply with the prescribed requirements to such an extent that no meaningful International Search can be carried out, specifically:
3. Claims Nos.: because they are dependent claims and are not drafted in accordance with the second and third sentences of Rule 6.4(a).

Box III Observations where unity of invention is lacking (Continuation of item 3 of first sheet)

This International Searching Authority found multiple inventions in this international application, as follows:

1. As all required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this International Search Report covers all searchable claims.
2. As all searchable claims could be searched without effort justifying an additional fee, this Authority did not invite payment of any additional fee.
3. As only some of the required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this International Search Report covers only those claims for which fees were paid, specifically claims Nos.:
4. No required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant. Consequently, this International Search Report is restricted to the invention first mentioned in the claims; it is covered by claims Nos.:

Remark on Protest

The additional search fees were accompanied by the applicant's protest.
 No protest accompanied the payment of additional search fees.

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

Information on patent family members

International Application No

/EP2004/005971

Patent document cited in search report	Publication date		Patent family member(s)	Publication date
WO 0206246	A 24-01-2002	AU CA WO EP JP US	7253001 A 2418288 A1 0206246 A1 1309566 A1 2004504304 T 2004106627 A1	30-01-2002 24-01-2002 24-01-2002 14-05-2003 12-02-2004 03-06-2004

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference ITTO057	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/EP2004/005971	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 01 June 2004 (01.06.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 09 June 2003 (09.06.2003)]
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC ⁷ A61K 31/4412, 31/4418, C07D 213/89, 409/12, A61P 31/12		
Applicant ISTITUTO DI RICERCHE DI BIOLOGIA MOLECOLARE P ANGELETTI SPA		

<p>1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).</p> <p>2. This REPORT consists of a total of 8 sheets, including this cover sheet.</p> <p>In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.</p>																									
<p>3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: right; vertical-align: top;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> </td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: right; vertical-align: top;"> <input type="checkbox"/> </td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: right; vertical-align: top;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> </td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: right; vertical-align: top;"> <input type="checkbox"/> </td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: right; vertical-align: top;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> </td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: right; vertical-align: top;"> <input type="checkbox"/> </td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: right; vertical-align: top;"> <input type="checkbox"/> </td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: right; vertical-align: top;"> <input type="checkbox"/> </td> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: right; vertical-align: top;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> </td> </tr> <tr> <td>Box No. I</td> <td>Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table> <p>4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report	Box No. II	Priority	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																	
Box No. I	Basis of the report																								
Box No. II	Priority																								
Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																								
Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																								
Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																								
Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																								
Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																								
Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																								

<p>The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland</p> <p>Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35</p>	<p>Date of issuance of this report 13 December 2005 (13.12.2005)</p> <p>Authorized officer Yolaine Cussac</p> <p>Telephone No. +41 22 338 70 80</p>
--	--

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

RECEIVED

11 OCT 2004

PCT PCT

PTII

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

<p>Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)</p>

<p>Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220</p>	<p>FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below</p>
---	--

<p>International application No. PCT/EP2004/005971</p>	<p>International filing date (day/month/year) 01.06.2004</p>	<p>Priority date (day/month/year) 09.06.2003</p>
--	--	--

<p>International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC A61K31/4412, A61K31/4418, C07D213/89, C07D409/12, A61P31/12</p>
--

<p>Applicant ISTITUTO DI RICERCHE DI BIOLOGIA MOLECOLARE P ...</p>
--

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

<p>Name and mailing address of the ISA:</p>	<p>Authorized Officer</p>
---	---------------------------



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Bérillon, L

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7078



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/005971

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material:

a sequence listing
 table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material:

in written format
 in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing:

contained in the international application as filed.
 filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/005971

Box No. II Priority

1. The following document has not been furnished:

- copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).
- translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

the entire international application,
 claims Nos. 14

because:

the said international application, or the said claims Nos. 14 relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

see separate sheet

the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):
 the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
 no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.
 the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form

has not been furnished
 does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form

has not been furnished
 does not comply with the standard

the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

See separate sheet for further details

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/005971

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or
industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-17
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-17 but see separate sheet
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-13,15-17
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item III

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

Claim 14 relates to subject-matter considered by this Authority to be covered by the provisions of Rule 67.1(iv) PCT. Consequently, no opinion will be formulated with respect to the industrial applicability of the subject-matter of this claim (Article 34(4)(a)(I) PCT).

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

- 1 Prior art

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: WO 02/06246

- 2 Novelty (Article 33(2) PCT)

The claimed compounds differ from those disclosed in D1 (see D1, claim 1) in that they are pyridine derivatives. D1 discloses pyrimidine derivatives instead. Accordingly, the present application is novel.

- 3 Inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT)

The technical problem underlying the present application is regarded as the provision of further compounds useful for the treatment of hepatitis C. D1 which represents the closest prior art equally discloses compounds useful for the treatment of said disease. The present compounds differ significantly from those of D1 (see item 2) and are therefore not anticipated by the prior. Hence, an inventive step could in theory be acknowledged for the present compounds. However, it should be made credible that all the claimed compounds are solutions of the posed technical problem. This is not the case at present since the claimed scope extend to compounds which cannot be regarded as close analogs of the exemplified compounds (examples 1-5

of pages 17-27). In addition, it is noted that the claims contain numerous open-ended expressions (e.g. "aryl", "heteroaryl", "optionally substituted" etc.) for which it would hardly be possible to show any technical effect in a representative manner.

4 Industrial applicability (Article 33(4) PCT)

For the assessment of the present claim 14 on the question whether it is industrially applicable, no unified criteria exist in the PCT Contracting States. The patentability can also be dependent upon the formulation of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognize as industrially applicable the subject-matter of claims to the use of a compound in medical treatment, but may allow, however, claims to a known compound for first use in medical treatment and the use of such a compound for the manufacture of a medicament for a new medical treatment.

Re Item VIII

Certain observations on the international application

The present claim 8 does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT in that the matter for which protection is sought is not clearly defined. The term "relatively hydrophobic" has no precise meaning. It is thus unclear which specific compounds fall within the scope of claim 8.

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PTII

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

RECEIVED

11 OCT 2004

PCT PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

(16/12)	Date of mailing (day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)
---------	---

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/005971

International filing date (day/month/year)
01.06.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
09.06.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
A61K31/4412, A61K31/4418, C07D213/89, C07D409/12, A61P31/12

Applicant
ISTITUTO DI RICERCHE DI BIOLOGIA MOLECOLARE P ...

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Bérillon, L

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7078



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/005971

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).

2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:

a. type of material:

a sequence listing
 table(s) related to the sequence listing

b. format of material:

in written format
 in computer readable form

c. time of filing/furnishing:

contained in the international application as filed.
 filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.

3. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/005971

Box No. II Priority

1. The following document has not been furnished:

copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).
 translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/005971

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

the entire international application,
 claims Nos. 14

because:

the said international application, or the said claims Nos. 14 relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

see separate sheet

the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):
 the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.
 no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos.
 the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form

has not been furnished
 does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form

has not been furnished
 does not comply with the standard

the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

See separate sheet for further details

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/EP2004/005971

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or
industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-17
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-17 but see separate sheet
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-13,15-17
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

see separate sheet

Re Item III

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

Claim 14 relates to subject-matter considered by this Authority to be covered by the provisions of Rule 67.1(iv) PCT. Consequently, no opinion will be formulated with respect to the industrial applicability of the subject-matter of this claim (Article 34(4)(a)(I) PCT).

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1 Prior art

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: WO 02/06246

2 Novelty (Article 33(2) PCT)

The claimed compounds differ from those disclosed in D1 (see D1, claim 1) in that they are pyridine derivatives. D1 discloses pyrimidine derivatives instead. Accordingly, the present application is novel.

3 Inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT)

The technical problem underlying the present application is regarded as the provision of further compounds useful for the treatment of hepatitis C. D1 which represents the closest prior art equally discloses compounds useful for the treatment of said disease. The present compounds differ significantly from those of D1 (see item 2) and are therefore not anticipated by the prior. Hence, an inventive step could in theory be acknowledged for the present compounds. However, it should be made credible that all the claimed compounds are solutions of the posed technical problem. This is not the case at present since the claimed scope extend to compounds which cannot be regarded as close analogs of the exemplified compounds (examples 1-5

of pages 17-27). In addition, it is noted that the claims contain numerous open-ended expressions (e.g. "aryl", "heteroaryl", "optionally substituted" etc.) for which it would hardly be possible to show any technical effect in a representative manner.

4 Industrial applicability (Article 33(4) PCT)

For the assessment of the present claim 14 on the question whether it is industrially applicable, no unified criteria exist in the PCT Contracting States. The patentability can also be dependent upon the formulation of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognize as industrially applicable the subject-matter of claims to the use of a compound in medical treatment, but may allow, however, claims to a known compound for first use in medical treatment and the use of such a compound for the manufacture of a medicament for a new medical treatment.

Re Item VIII

Certain observations on the international application

The present claim 8 does not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT in that the matter for which protection is sought is not clearly defined. The term "relatively hydrophobic" has no precise meaning. It is thus unclear which specific compounds fall within the scope of claim 8.